

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
JULY 8, 2015**

**CALL TO
ORDER**

A meeting of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. at the Earl Bennett Building, Conference Rooms A and B, 1035 1st Ave W, Kalispell, Montana. Board members present were Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Kevin Lake, Dean Sirucek, Jim Heim, Jeff Larsen, Mike Horn and Greg Stevens. Ron Schlegel and Tim Calaway had excused absences. BJ Grieve, Erik Mack and Mark Mussman represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

There were 4 people in the audience.

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES
6:00 pm**

Larsen made a motion, seconded by Stevens to approve the May 13, 2015 and June 10, 2015 meeting minutes.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT
(not related to
agenda items)
6:01 pm**

None.

**EDWARD AND
LISA WOLFE
(FZC-15-02)
6:01 pm**

A Zone Change request in the Highway 93 North Zoning District by Edward & Lisa Wolfe. The proposal would change the zoning on five (5) parcels containing 78 acres from AG-40 (Agricultural) to SAG-5 (Suburban Agricultural). The five subject parcels are located at and around 739 Prairie View Road.

STAFF REPORT

Grieve reviewed Staff Report FZC-15-02 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Erica Wirtitla, Sands Surveying, represented the applicant. She said at this time, her client did not have any immediate plans for the property. He had purchased the property as a long term investment. The property had several parcels. He would like to do some family transfers in the far off future. At this time, he planned to farm the property for some time. Her client was available for questions. She gave a brief history of why they brought forth the application. Initially they asked for R-2.5

zoning. After looking at the requirements for R-2.5, they thought SAG-5 was a good fit and an expansion of current SAG-5 zoning in the area. She was available if the board had any questions.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Hickey-AuClaire confirmed no written comments had been received.

No public rose to speak.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

None.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FZC-15-02)**

Stevens made a motion seconded by Larsen to adopt staff report FZC-15-02 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Stevens said it seemed to be a complete staff report and there was no opposition to the zone change. The parcel was over half surrounded by SAG-5 at this time. It was a smooth approval.

Heim commented on a statement from the last meeting which was five acres was too big to mow and too small to farm. He had met a 95 year old man who owned five acres and just recently had been unable to mow his acreage. The way he now maintained the property was not an eyesore.

Sirucek said in the last three months the board had seen three or four applications which had wanted to transition to SAG-5. He commented just because the property was adjacent to SAG-5, they didn't need to be zoned SAG-5. If every property which was adjacent to SAG-5 became zoned SAG-5, then everything would be SAG-5 at some time.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Sirucek asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FZC-15-02)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
CONDITIONS
(FZC-15-02)**

Larsen made a motion seconded by Lake to adopt Staff Report FZC-15-02 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Stevens asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF
(FZC-15-02)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**GROWTH
POLICY
AMENDMENT
(FPMA-15-02)
6:18 pm**

A request by the Flathead County Planning Board for an amendment to the text and map of the Flathead County Growth Policy (Growth Policy) for an area around the City of Whitefish and formerly within the Extraterritorial Area (ETA) of the Interlocal Agreement between Flathead County and the City of Whitefish. The general character of the specific proposed amendment is:

Amend the Growth Policy map to change the Designated Land Use Map from the Whitefish City-County Master Plan Map designations to 'Scenic Corridor,' 'Resort Residential and Commercial Land Use,' 'Commercial Land Use,' 'Special Commercial Land Use,' 'Industrial Land Use,' 'Residential Lane Use,' 'Suburban Agricultural Land Use,' and 'Agricultural Land Use.'

Amend the Growth Policy text by removing references in the text to the Interlocal Agreement, removing references to the Whitefish City-County Master Plan from 'Table 11.1 Existing Plans and Dates of Most Recent Adoption' and adding the Big Mountain,

Big Mountain West and South Whitefish Neighborhood Plans to Table 11.1.'

STAFF REPORT Mack reviewed Staff Report FPMA-15-02 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS** None.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS** Dave Taylor, Planning and Building Director for the City of Whitefish, wanted to comment on both agenda items at once. He mentioned the county had had an adopted growth plan around Whitefish since the early 1960's with detailed future land use maps. The city was concerned about rescinding the 1996 map which would leave the area around Whitefish with no long range planning. They recognized the plan had been outdated and superseded. Whitefish had superseded it with the 2007 Whitefish Growth Policy. They had a concern that rescinding the plan would leave the area without any long term goals in place or maps as to how the area could be zoned or how property could be rezoned around the city. They asked the board consider looking at Whitefish's future land use map and taking it into consideration when making future decisions on zoning. The areas which were in Whitefish's service area would be eventually annexed. Whitefish would need to take off the zoning at that time. He handed out a letter to the board which reviewed what he spoke on.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT** Mayre Flowers, Citizens for a Better Flathead, 35 4th Street West, had difficulty with her computer, so her comments would not be as detailed as she would like. She had emailed a hard copy to the office before the meeting and said the board could view it later. (Received by office at 5:54 pm on 7-8-15, included in information sent to Commissioners.) Citizens for a Better Flathead's comments had been combined into one set of comments for both items on the agenda. She went through in detail the findings which they did not agree with and the reasons why.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL** Mack wanted to say Flowers' comment on the lack of discussion concerning the rescindment of the master plan would be addressed by the next item. Retaining the Whitefish City-County Master Plan in the growth policy had been discussed in the workshops and had been deemed impossible because the plan was very outdated and the Whitefish Growth Policy had been updated and zoning was based on that plan. The county would not be able to do zoning compatible with Whitefish based on the

Whitefish City-County Master Plan.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Heim said it was his understanding there were steps to make this transition possible. This was a necessary step before they could move further.

Stevens said this whole process was not something the board came up with or wanted to be involved with. It was a result of a court decision and a result of workshops where they had taken public comment from the land owners in the area. He reviewed the workshops and when they decided to move forward with the growth policy amendment. They had gone over the information intensively, had a lot of testimony, and a lot of board discussion. He was comfortable with what they had done and the way they were going. He would support the application.

Larsen said they had talked ad nauseum about whether or not they would include the Whitefish map into their documents. He explained the tools they were required to use to consider zoning by Montana Statute. They also had the growth policy. There were two documents the board could look at when considering zoning. The 1996 Whitefish City-County Master Plan was outdated. The goals and policies were not consistent with what existed in the area now. It had never been updated, so there was not a lot of community interest, wasn't a lot of interest in updating that particular plan, in Flathead County. Right now, they were supposed to update the growth policy every five years. The plan was out of compliance with the growth policy. There were other neighborhood plans which were out of compliance. He felt comfortable with how they were handling the situation. They had a lot of discussion and a lot of input about whether or not they were going to put the map in the growth policy. They would consider the map, their nearby zoning and consider the growth policy when they looked at zoning the area. He was comfortable with the process they had followed. They had a lot of information and had taken a lot of public input and he would support the proposal.

MAIN MOTION TO ADOPT F.O.F. (FPMA-15-02)

Sirucek made a motion seconded by Horn to adopt findings of fact for FPMA-15-02.

BOARD DISCUSSION

None.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Horn asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FPMA-15-02)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL BY
RESOLUTION
(FPMA-15-02)**

Stevens made a motion seconded by Heim to adopt Staff Report FPMA-15-02 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners by resolution which Stevens read:

WHEREAS, the Flathead County Board of County Commissioners adopted the Flathead County Growth Policy on March 19, 2007 by Resolution #2015A; and

WHEREAS, the Flathead County Board of County Commissioners approved the Updated Flathead County Growth Policy on October 12, 2012 by Resolution #2015R pursuant to 76-1-604 M.C.A.; and

WHEREAS, the Flathead County Growth Policy contains a provision for an Amendment Initiated by the Governing Body in Part 7 Chapter 10.

WHEREAS, on May 1, 2015, an application for an Amendment Initiated by the Governing Body to the Flathead County Growth Policy was submitted for consideration by the Flathead County Planning Board.

WHEREAS, pursuant to 76-1-602(2) M.C.A., a legal notice of the Flathead County Planning Board public hearing on the proposed Amendment Initiated by the Governing Body did appear in the Daily Interlake on June 14, 2015.

WHEREAS, pursuant to 76-1-602 M.C.A., the Flathead County Planning Board held a public hearing regarding the amendment on July 8, 2015 and considered the public comments received at that hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Flathead County Planning Board did consider all recommendations and suggestions elicited at the public hearing and did adopt findings of fact based on criteria for plan amendments found in Part 7 of Chapter 10 of the Flathead County Growth Policy; and

AND WHEREAS the Findings of Fact adopted do generally support the proposed Amendment Initiated by the Governing Body.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Flathead County Planning Board hereby recommends the Flathead County Board of County Commissioners adopt the proposed amendment to the Flathead County Growth Policy, pursuant to 76-1-603(1), M.C.A.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Horn asked the question.

**ROLL CALL
VOTE TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL BY
RESOLUTION
(FPMA-15-02)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The board and Mack held a brief discussion concerning appropriate places for signatures on the resolution.

Hickey-AuClaire reviewed the process the application would follow from this point on.

**RECINDMENT
OF WHITEFISH
CITY-COUNTY
MASTER PLAN
(FPMA-15-03)
6:51 pm**

A request by the Flathead County Planning Board to rescind the Whitefish City-County Master Plan as an element of the Flathead County Growth Policy. The Whitefish City-County Master Plan consists of Sections 33, 34, 35, 36, the South ½ of Sections 25, 26 and 27 and a portion of Sections 28 and 32 of Township 32 North, Range 22 West, P.M.M. in Flathead County, Montana, Sections 31, 32 and 33, the South ½ of Sections 29 and 30 and a portion of Section 34 of Township 32 North, Range 21 West, P.M.M. in Flathead County, Montana, Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35 and 36, the East ½ of Section 7 and a portion of Section 6 of Township 31 North, Range 22 West, P.M.M. in Flathead County, Montana, Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 of Township 31 North, Range 21 West, P.M.M. in

Flathead County, Montana, Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the North ½ of Sections 22 and 23 of Township 30 North, Range 22 West, P.M.M. in Flathead County, Montana and Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 30 and a portion of Sections 2 ,22, 23, 28 and 29 of Township 30 North, Range 21 West, P.M.M. in Flathead County, Montana, outside of the City of Whitefish's city limits.

STAFF REPORT Mack reviewed Staff Report FPMA-15-03 for the Board.

BOARD QUESTIONS Sirucek and Mack discussed areas which had conflict between the 1996 Whitefish City-County Master Plan zoning and current county zoning.

Stevens talked in detail about the difference between growth policies and master plans and how they worked together.

PUBLIC AGENCY None.

PUBLIC COMMENT Hickey-AuClaire confirmed there had been no additional written comments received.

Mayre Flowers, Citizens for a Better Flathead, 35 4th Street West. In the hard copy she had emailed to the Planning Office, (received by office at 5:54 pm on 7-8-15, included in information sent to Commissioners) they had addressed both amendments before the board. In her rush to comment on the last item, she had rushed through the findings for FPMA-15-03 instead of FPMA-15-02. She wanted her comments to be a part of the record. She wanted to reemphasize the interim zoning process the board was going through was based on the declaring of an emergency they needed to address. As part of the emergency, the board had a responsibility to take the time to do the work to update plans and to ensure that they had adequate policies in place for the extraterritorial area around the city of Whitefish. The growth pressures that area faced and the distinctions between the goals of Whitefish and those of the county really needed to be fleshed out and recognized. The need to update the section on the growth policy for coordination with Whitefish had been ignored in this process. This was not just a step in the board's process. It should have been a very comprehensive undertaking. There had not been a look at bringing forward policies in the updated Whitefish 2007 Growth Policy. Many of

the goals in the 1996 plan were very similar if not identical to ones that were carried forward to the 2007 plan. Again, the analysis had not been done in this process and she thought that was inadequate for the scale and scope of change that the board was initiating by removing this plan. What was before the board, again, was not a result of a court decision, what changed only was the decision makers and as a decision maker she thought they had an obligation to incorporate, as they had for Kalispell and Columbia Falls, much more detailed plans that recognized the needs of these growing cities. She would also like to mention that in the 2012 growth policy, the revisions the board did most recently significantly changed the character and nature of the designated land use map and they were currently in litigation with the county over that amendment in part because of the changes to that map they did not believe complied with the growth policy statutes. So again, removing this map, removing this plan, given the nature of their current map, she thought compounded the issues and the inadequacy of the amendment before the board at this meeting.

Larsen said he never did get any hard copy of the letter Flowers spoke about. He asked when Flowers sent the letter.

Flowers said she sent it to the board after 5 o'clock because she could not get her printer to work.

Larsen asked how the board was supposed to get the letter if she had sent it after five o'clock. The office was closed.

Flowers and the board discussed if staff could print off the comment, when Flowers had viewed the information for the agenda items, other work Flowers did and how long she had been working on her comments.

The board thanked Flowers for her comments.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Hickey-AuClaire and Mack discussed if the 2007 Whitefish growth policy map had been adopted by the county into the county growth policy, if the board could accept the 2007 document if it had not been adopted, Kalispell's growth policy which had never been adopted by the county and which plan the county used for the Kalispell area which was the 1986 version.

They also discussed if working on interlocal agreements were ever a consideration in updating the Growth Policy.

Stevens asked that Taylor be recognized.

Taylor said in 2007, the area of the 2007 Whitefish Growth Policy was fully in Whitefish's jurisdiction because of the interlocal agreement. The county did not need to adopt the policy because the area was fully in the jurisdiction of Whitefish and Whitefish was under the assumption that the interlocal agreement was permanent. The county didn't want to deal with all the headaches in Whitefish and was happy to let Whitefish deal with the issues on their own.

Stevens said taking into consideration the comments from Whitefish who was represented at the meeting, and Citizens for a Better Flathead who was represented at the meeting, a couple of issues were brought up. One of the comments concerned ignoring coordination with Whitefish. In his view, he did not feel he was ignoring any input from Whitefish. Taylor had taken a lot of time to be at the meetings as the city of Whitefish Planning Director, and he had always paid close attention to what he had to say. He thought Taylor had communications with the county planning director outside of the public venue basically because the board had needed help with information. It was not his intent or feeling he was going to ignore anything from Whitefish. The planning director had been present to give input. He said as far as the designated land use maps, it was his understanding they were a representation of what was on the ground, not to be used as a representation of what that land should be used for necessarily going forward. What he heard Citizens for a Better Flathead bring up was a legal point. Apparently there was some litigation going on about the use of designated land use maps. Maybe there was. His problem was he was not an attorney. If there was a legal question about the status of a designated land use map, he could not answer those legal questions, he could only go ahead and do what he thought was the appropriate thing to be done in light of the public comments at many workshops and public testimony at meetings afterwards, to try to decide what was the best thing going forward for the welfare of the people in the jurisdiction and the welfare of the people in the county. He thought they were on the right track that would come up with a good resolution to the problem that was presented to the board by virtue of the fact that the people in that jurisdiction were terribly unhappy with what was going on.

They were essentially without a voice, essentially without any representation because they were county residents and the city was determining what could or could not be done with their private property. This was not a short time, hit or miss thing. They had been involved in the process for at least nine months. This was not a shoot from the hip endeavor. They had been involved in this process for nine months, probably more than that before they had ever held the first series of public workshops. Legal questions aside, what he was trying to do as a planning board member, given the information he had and input he had, were they proceeding in the right way? It looked like to him they were. In all the discussions in the workshops, at the board discussion part, they talked about the need to make it conform as much as possible to the city of Whitefish's land use desires and take into account they had to deal with the Flathead County Growth Policy. They were governed by the Flathead County Growth Policy not the city of Whitefish growth policy. They took into consideration theirs but were guided by the county growth policy. He thought they were doing a good job up to this point of resolving those things. He felt they were doing a pretty darn good job. He would support this application.

Larsen said the designated land use maps were never intended to designate what you could do with the property. It was an inventory of what was on the ground. They had almost put into the growth policy a tax assessment map of property at one time then the board suggested doing an inventory of what existing zoning and neighborhood plan districts were. It was never intended to be a guidance of what a person could do. It was a snapshot in time. People could argue all they wanted but they knew what the board discussion on that was. They knew what they meant it to be and how it was supposed to be. What also bothered the board was just adopting all of those neighborhood plans. There was a different statute when the neighborhood plans were produced. They were produced under a master plan statute. There were different elements in that master plan that gave them a certain time to get the growth policy created because it was not compliant with that. That bothered him when those neighborhood plans were just adopted. The board had never updated them and made them growth policy compliant. That was a problem they had with the '96 master plan. They also had a problem with some of the other plans in there. He would ask that question and the board would just let it go. It was an issue and should be brought up now. To say the neighborhood plans were in compliance and that they had been worked on through

these years, they hadn't been. They hadn't been updated. The West Valley Neighborhood plan was about 25 years old, and hadn't been updated and wasn't growth policy compliant either. They had some issues there. He listened to Taylor quite a bit as well. They had discussions of whether they would put in the Whitefish map or not. He was in favor of that to start with but there was a lot of public comment against putting the map in county documents because of bad feelings with Whitefish. The board had also talked about the statute which made the board look at the map, look at their zoning. They did not need to have the map put in the growth policy in order to do that. They were already told they had to look at the map by statute. The board thought that was a good compromise, especially based on the public comment they received. They had a lot of public comment from people in the donut area that they wanted to be left alone by Whitefish. That was what they got a lot of public comment on. He had seen a lot of public comment that they didn't even like them to use a W in the zoning district because they thought that meant Whitefish. He thought they had tried to be as compatible as they could with Whitefish zoning districts. The planning staff had made the interim zoning as compatible as they could with Whitefish's zoning. You couldn't try to be any more compatible than that. It was the closest zoning districts they had in their tool box of zonings that they could come up with that they could get as close to Whitefish as they could. They didn't try to change everything Whitefish had done. They tried to be compatible with it. They had an opportunity. Some people said 'unzone the area we just want a free for all.' The board did not go down that route. They considered what Whitefish had done. The board was trying to compromise. They were getting comments from Whitefish, they paid attention to them. They also had comments from people in the donut who had wanted nothing to do with Whitefish. They knew as they went forward, they would be working with Whitefish. They were going to be looking at their planning documents because they were required to by state statute. They had also done their zoning basically almost in compliance with how Whitefish had done it. He felt really good about the process. They had a lot of different public comment. They took it into consideration and put out a lot of different scenarios on how they were going to address this issue. He thought they had gone down the right track. He was in favor of this.

Horn said to summarize it, it appears that the supreme court decision of the lawsuit was based on the fact principally that

people in the donut did not like what Whitefish represented in their Whitefish zoning map. So, what the board had done, in part the best they could, was to take into consideration people in this zoning in the donut district that in fact were the proponents or the litigants on this decision by the supreme court.

Heim said what Stevens and Larsen had said didn't bear repeating. He thought they articulated his thoughts better than he could have. They had both been around enough to know lots of background on what was going on. He supported the proposal as written.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FPMA-15-03)**

Sirucek made a motion seconded by Larsen to adopt staff report FPMA-15-03 as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ASK THE
QUESTION**

Sirucek asked the question.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FPMA-15-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL BY
RESOLUTION
(FPMA-15-03)**

Stevens made a motion seconded by Sirucek to adopt Staff Report FPMA-15-03 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners by resolution which Stevens read:

RESOLUTION
FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
WHITEFISH CITY-COUNTY MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

WHEREAS, the Flathead County Board of County Commissioners adopted the Whitefish City-County Master Plan on February 6, 1996 by Resolution #677-G; and

WHEREAS, the Flathead County Board of County Commissioners approved the Updated Flathead County Growth Policy on October 12, 2012 pursuant to 76-1-604 M.C.A., which

incorporated the 1996 Whitefish City-County Master Plan as an addendum to the Flathead County Growth Policy; and

WHEREAS, the Flathead County Growth Policy contains a provision for an Amendment Initiated by the Governing Body in Part 7 Chapter 10.

WHEREAS, on May 1, 2015, an application for an Amendment Initiated by the Governing Body to the Whitefish City-County Master Plan was submitted for consideration by the Flathead County Planning Board.

WHEREAS, pursuant to 76-1-602(2) M.C.A., a legal notice of the Flathead County Planning Board public hearing on the proposed Amendment Initiated by the Governing Body did appear in the Daily Interlake on June 14, 2015.

WHEREAS, pursuant to 76-1-602 M.C.A., the Flathead County Planning Board held a public hearing regarding the amendment on July 8, 2015 and considered the public comments received at that hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Flathead County Planning Board did consider all recommendations and suggestions elicited at the public hearing and did adopt findings of fact based on criteria for plan amendments found in Part 7 of Chapter 10 of the Flathead County Growth Policy; and

WHEREAS, there are no additional and more specific criteria for amendments to the Whitefish City-County Master Plan contained in that document; and

WHEREAS the Findings of Fact adopted do generally support the proposed Amendment Initiated by the Governing Body.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Flathead County Planning Board hereby recommends the Flathead County Board of County Commissioners adopt the proposed amendment to rescind the Whitefish City-County Master Plan pursuant to 76-1-603(1), M.C.A.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL BY
RESOLUTION
(FPMA-15-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Hickey-AuClaire reviewed what process the application would follow from this point on.

OLD BUSINESS

Mussman discussed the extension of the interim rural zoning in the Whitefish area for an additional year. According to Montana State Code, a study had needed to be initiated. The study was complete. He handed out information to the board which was a brief outline of the history and why the extension was needed to read at their leisure. The interim zoning would expire in September of 2015. With the extension, the expiration date would be September of 2016. Within that timeframe, permanent zoning should hopefully be established.

Mack noted the zoning text amendment and the creation of the zoning district would be before the board in September.

Mack and the board briefly discussed if they had put 'for illustrative purposes only' on the maps in the growth policy and the reasons why.

Mussman handed to the board the strategic work plan for the planning office for fiscal year 2016. A lot of the non-discretionary work would be concentrated on finalizing the zoning in the rural Whitefish area with a successful conclusion. Other work for the office included an update to the floodplain regulations. The office had received a letter of final determination from FEMA for some revised flood insurance rate maps. He summarized which maps had been revised, how they had been revised and what information had been used to revise them. He also explained the benefits of having the updated maps. Next was finalizing the interim Evergreen Enterprise overlay. He went back to the floodplain and floodplain regulations and said they needed to be updated because there were new maps and they needed to be updated before November fourth which was when the new maps took effect. Step one was adopting the maps. Step two might go further into looking at the rest of the regulations and modifying them accordingly. He thought it was very important to get on the flood ordinance now. November seemed like it was a long ways away, but it would be

here sooner than later. They needed to get the maps adopted by November fourth. Additional revisions and amendments to the floodplain and floodway regulations may occur later in fiscal year 2016. Also, they were going to investigate the lake and lakeshore protection regulations. There might be some helpful things Whitefish had in their regulations which could help the county and Whitefish lakeshore regulations be more consistent. Last on the plan was consideration of discussion on a Highway 93 South transition district. He was looking forward to working with the board.

NEW BUSINESS The board and staff discussed when the next scheduled meeting was which was September 9, 2015 and if there was any items which needed to be considered for the Whitefish transition in August.

ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:44 pm. on a motion by Larsen. The next meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on September 9, 2015.

Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Chairman

Donna Valade, Recording Secretary

*APPROVED AS **SUBMITTED**/CORRECTED: 9 / 9 / 15*